

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 2-4 and rejected same. With this paper, claim 2 is amended, claim 3 is canceled, and none are added. The application now includes claims 2 and 4.

Claim rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Speakman (U.S. Patent 6,164,850).

In Fig. 1 of Speakman, a layered structure is illustrated. Speakman teaches forming a three-dimensional pattern on a substrate by applying (1) a surface pretreatment layer 10 of epoxy acrylic, (2) repeatedly applying build-up layers 12, 14 and 16 and curing each layer by radiation treatment, and (3) applying a top layer 18 that is a silicon-loaded layer.

However, Speakman does not teach the second step of claim 2, i.e. forming a colored image on the three-dimensional pattern by applying an ultraviolet ray curable ink containing a coloring component. The top layer 18 in Speakman is a silicon loaded layer that does not seem to contain any color component (a color component may be a color pigment or a dye, as described in page 12, line 15 of the instant application). In fact, what is formed by the method of Speakman is a raised structure on a flat surface. The raised structure is clearly distinguished from the three-dimensional colored image as described in the present application. Therefore, claim 2 is not anticipated by Speakman.

With this paper, claim 2 is amended to incorporate limitations originally in claim 3, and claim 3 is canceled. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 and dependent claim 4 is respectfully requested.

Claim rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eid *et al* (US Patent 5,972,545, Eid hereinafter).

Eid relates to a method for production of a color filter for a flat panel liquid crystal display. It discloses that a transparent raised pattern is formed on a substrate by using a transparent ultraviolet curable ink, and the individual colored ink patterns are then deposited within the recesses formed by the raised pattern to form a color filter pattern (column 3, line 35 to column 4, line 52).

Eid is different from the first step of claim 2 in that the transparent raised pattern is not formed by applying a transparent ultraviolet ray curable ink by ink jet printing and then curing by ultraviolet rays. Rather, the transparent raised pattern is formed by a patterned intaglio roller in contact with the substrate (col. 3, line 50 - col.4, line 6 and Fig. 2). By rolling the intaglio roller on the substrate, the cured transparent ink is left on the substrate at certain intervals to form a matrix grid with rectangular recessed spaces.

Eid is also different from the second step of claim 2 in that no colored image is formed on the three-dimensional pattern by applying an ultraviolet ray curable ink containing a coloring component. According to Eid, the matrix grid is intended to use as a partition for individual colored ink to be deposited on the substrate, and colored ink is deposited inside the formed recessed spaces, not on the top of the grid form by the transparent ink.

In the present invention, as illustrated in Fig. 5, at first, the transparent ink is applied on the cloth 1 and cured with ultraviolet rays to form a transparent ink layer 14, and then the color ink 13 is applied on the cloth on top of the transparent ink layer 14. This kind of structure resembles a laminate structure comprising a transparent ink layer and a color ink layer thereon. By utilizing the process as claimed in claim 2, excellent effects on printing quality can be attained. These effects include a smooth surface of the image, reduced diffuse

reflection and high optical density of the printed images. Also, by applying color ink after applying transparent ink, bleeding can be prevented. When transparent ink is applied to the cloth, the transparent ink may bleed, but because the ink is transparent, bleeding is not a problem.

Claim 2 is amended to recite that the inks are applied on a cloth. Therefore, the present invention has clearly distinguished from Eid that the process is for ink jet printing on the cloth.

Based on the foregoing, it is believed that the currently amended claim 2 is patentable in view of Eid. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 and dependent claim 4 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that all the remaining claims of the instant application are in condition for allowance, and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's agent urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

Respectfully submitted,



Shiming Wu
Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 56,885

Date: April 23, 2007

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234